

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated June 29, 2005 (U.S. Patent Office Paper No. 06202005). In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

As outlined above, claims 2-3 are being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, while claim 1 is being amended to correct formal errors and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject invention, in particular to substantially incorporate the recitations of claims 2-3. Claims 7-22 stand withdrawn from consideration in this application. Applicant hereby submits that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Prior Art Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) on the grounds of being anticipated by Katayama et al. (US Patent No. 5,151,807). Further, the Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katayama et al. '807 in view of Liu et al. (US Patent No. 5,518,956). Applicants have reviewed the above-noted rejections, and hereby respectfully traverse.

The present invention as recited in claim 1 is directed to a display device forming a display region where a plurality of films including an insulation film, a semiconductor film and a conductive film are patterned in a given pattern and stacked on a substrate, wherein at a point of time that at least one correction portion out of a correction portion which separates a short-circuit defect, a correction portion which connects an opening defect, a correction portion which removes a standard deviation defect, and a correction portion which separates a standard deviation defect of the pattern is corrected, at least one upper-layer film is present above a film to be corrected at the correction portion and the correction is applied to the film to be corrected while leaving the upper-layer film as it is. The correction of the correction portion is performed by the irradiation of a laser beam through the at least one upper layer film from a side opposite to the substrate.

In contrast to the present invention, Katayama '807 does not disclose or suggest "the correction of the correction portion is performed by irradiating a laser beams through the at least one upper layer film from a side opposite to the substrate" of claim 1. Rather, Katayama '807 merely discloses "As shown by the arrows 136 and 137, the connection region 107 is irradiated with energy, such as laser beams, infrared rays or electron beams, from the outside through the lower glass substrate 101" (see Fig. 15, col. 18, line 67 – col. 19, line 2).

Applicant will contend that such a structure and operation from Katayama '807 are substantially different from the claimed invention as to constitute teachings that steer away from or even contradict the claimed invention. It is well established that a reference that is found to teach away from or contradict the claimed invention at issue cannot be properly cited as prior art against that invention. As a result, Katayama '807 cannot by itself anticipate or render obvious every feature of the claimed invention.

The secondary reference of Liu '956 was only cited for showing a particular feature recited in a dependent claim. This reference falls far short of providing any teaching or suggestion that would make up for the deficiencies in Katayama '807. Rather, even if these two references were combined, they together would still not show or suggest, among other features, "the correction of the correction portion is performed by irradiating a laser beams through the at least one upper layer film from a side opposite to the substrate". Consequently, the present invention as claimed is distinguishable and thereby allowable over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, Applicant respectfully submits that certain clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art references upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely. These differences are more than sufficient that the present invention as now claimed would not have been anticipated nor rendered obvious given the prior art. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to

contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344



Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive
Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

December 29, 2005